DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 760 IR 006 362

AUTHOR Bob, Murray L.
TITLE Access to Libraries and Information Services.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Library Systems Conference (Albany, New York, March 1-3, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Information Needs; *Information Seeking; *Libraries; Library Planning; *Library Services
IDENTIFIERS *Access (Information); New York

ABSTRACT

The unresolved aspects of access that were handled in the "Report of the Commissioner of Education's Committee on Library Development, 1970" and the "Report of the Commissioner of Education's Committee on Direct Access, 1974" are discussed. Travel distance to libraries providing reference and referral, interlibrary loan, and on-line data base service should be within 20 to 30 minutes of users. Libraries must follow the example of increased hours of opening set by business to accommodate the new social living patterns of today's families. Though library service is free, the cost in time to go to the library could be reduced by mobile service, storefront reading centers, work-place libraries, and mail-order service. Radio, television, and computer technology can reduce the time factor in obtaining information. The concept of a statewide library card, good in all libraries, refuses to die. The policy of not charging for library services should continue, as the introduction of fees would create a barrier to the "information-poor" in our communities. (Author/JAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED158760

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ACCESS TO LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SERVICES

by

Murray L. Bob

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. J. Josey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR006362

ACCESS TO LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SERVICES

By Murray L. Bob

There is a sense in which the issue of access appears to comprehend all other issues. Consider that questions of intellectual freedom are questions of access; that the principle of equalization of library service to the handicapped, culturally and economically deprived, linguistically differentiated, geographically remote is, in essence, a matter of access; that the worrisome problems of copyright, fee for service, physical barriers, open shelf versus closed shelf, outreach, service to the inner city, rising costs of materials and services--all impact on access. And the concept itself fractionates under examination into such sub-sets as convenient access, quick access, free or fee access, more or less equal access. For, despite all hyperbole, completely free, equal, and total access is probably an impossibility, not only because a category implies its opposite--accessibility/inaccessibility, but because it is unlikely that everything can be made accessible to everyone who might want it at precisely the time he wants it. The universe of possible demand will always exceed the universe of probable supply and thus choices will always have to be made and reason exercised. The concern for access, in practice, is therefore a concern for greater or more access for more people.

A quick check through the last five years of the index, Library Literature, under the rubric, "access," yielded the following incomplete and hastily compiled list of issues:

1. The right of minors to read what they wish to read, rather than what their parents or teachers think they ought to read.

2. Archival access, notably the question of public ownership of papers of public officials.

3. The public's right to solid, as opposed to superficial, medical information.

4. The public as well as prisoners' right to effective access to legal materials; bibliographic and physical access to public documents by the citizenry.

5. The cost of computerized searches and document delivery, not to mention the complexity and the lack of standardization between data bases as barriers to information.

6. Fee for service of any kind, including traditional fines and fees as inhibitors of library use, especially by the "information poor."

7. Insufficient hours of library opening: School libraries generally unavailable evenings, weekends, holidays, summers; urban public libraries cutting back on hours; rural public libraries never having been open enough hours, etc.

8. Relative or absolute lack of community-wide access to school, junior college, college and university libraries.

9. The growing issue of library access for the increasing number of non-institutionally connected students in open-university type programs: Courses are offered without provision being made for back-up materials; there is no locus of library responsibility.

10. Geographic and physical barriers: Lack of nearby or convenient stationary libraries, or of libraries with adequate parking or proximity to public transportation; inability of handicapped to use library buildings.

11. Inadequate funding in a period of chronic inflation as a barrier to purchase of sufficient materials to maintain and develop collections and as a bar to hiring staff to help the public access the materials acquired.

12. Intellectual barriers for those for whom English is not the native language.

13. Intellectual barriers "for the majority of adult Americans, unable to read above the 6th grade level, for the many children whose reading ability falls below their chronological age, for the large number of functionally illiterate adults and young adults in our society."

14. "The civil libertarian's dilemma"--the conflict between freedom of information and the right to privacy.

15. Theft, loss and damage as barriers to use, and the larger question of whether unlimited access to collections for present-day users will jeopardize their existence for future years.

16. And, closely related to the above, the issue of whether there should be limitations on the circulation of types and numbers of materials to none, some (non-residents for example) or all or whether it is not "just as costly in the long run to exclude as it is to include."

17. Lack of reciprocal borrowing agreements; conversely, the problems in some places where such agreements exist, of over-use by other than primary, local clients, who in large measure pay for the service.

18. The relative lack of publicity for libraries and their informational resources and services as a barrier to use; most adults do not use libraries with any degree of frequency and many who do use them by no means take full advantage of their resources.

19. The "middle-class image" of the libraries as a barrier to their use by the poor and disadvantaged.

20. The anomaly that older and <u>now</u> relatively poorer institutions (universities, private and public, and large urban libraries) have the richest library collections (because time is as important as money in

collection building), while newer and relatively more affluent institutions (suburban libraries, community colleges) have poorer collections. Should or can the older institutions freely open their collections to use by the newer?

21. Copyright as an inhibitor to public access to ideas; copyright, conversely as a guarantor of the generation of ideas.

22. Non-physical barriers to information within the library: unweeded collections, obsolete information, lack of staff to help the public, lack of helpful staff, antiquated library classification systems and location schemes.

23. Lack of provision of a "sufficient number" of copies as a barrier to quick access; lack of provision of materials in a variety of formats as a barrier for those less able or willing to use print.

Despite the length of the list, the author has a gnawing suspicion that innumerable obvious aspects of the problem have been overlooked. In seeking for some principle of selection with which to both order the presentation and render it manageable within the confines of a brief paper, I have chosen, in the "New York tradition" to try to "build on strength." The essay will, therefore, discuss at length certain still unresolved aspects of Access that were handled in the Report of the Commissioner of Education's Committee on Library Development, 1970 (which will, in the interests of brevity, be referred to as the Hacker Report) and in the Report of the Commissioner of Education's Committee on Direct Access, 1974 (which will be referred to as the Geddes Report). It will deal to a lesser extent with several other access issues which are heightened by the economic situation, changing social attitudes, and the impact of technology.

ACCESS TO QUALITY RESOURCES AND SERVICES

In the words of the Hacker Report: "As yet (and there seems to be no prospect that the situation will change in the foreseeable future) there is no substitute for a library outlet which the user can actually visit with a practical degree of convenience--a place where he can browse in a collection of reasonable size, obtain professional assistance and gain access to network resources beyond the limitations of size and depth which apply to the library at hand." It would seem that that description is still true and thus that access to libraries, if not to information services must, for most users, mean free entry to and use of a nearby, conveniently located local library (college, school, university, special, or public), open enough hours and days that the patron may be able to make use of the facility at his/her convenience; staffed with professionals and trained non-professionals willing and able to help; provisioned with an adequate stock of materials in a variety of formats, sufficient to make the reader feel reasonably certain of getting most of what is wanted most of the time, either immediately or very soon. The library should be able to provide on-site ready reference and referral, be part of a state-wide network supplying interlibrary loan and reference service, and able to access on-line shared bibliographic data bases. Last, but by no means least, such a library should be located within 20 minutes of the urbanite, and 30 minutes of the non-urbanite using some practical means of transportation.

Within public library systems in 1970 there were parts of the state where such a facility did not exist, and the Hacker Report recommended consideration of and planning grant money for the establishment of a minimum number of "Intermediate Libraries" that would be able to provide the needed services. These would not be new libraries; rather, the thought

was to build up already existing, potentially strong libraries to the point where they could do the job: libraries, the choice of which, would make sense in terms of geography and population.[1] The concept still makes a great deal of sense and I would provisionally suggest that candidates for Intermediate Library status might be non-central libraries with collections of about 50,000 volumes, open about 6 days and 60 hours per week, spending about $9.00 per capita on library service, with a staff ratio, professional to non-professional of 1 to 2 or 3 (in any event a minimum of 1 full-time professional for every 6,000 persons served) in a building of at least 0.7 square feet p.c.

Special state aid would be provided such libraries to enable them to beef-up collections and services to a level where they could offer truly adequate assistance to surrounding communities. They would be "magnet" libraries and whatever special state aid they received would provide compensation for increased use, local and extra-local, such aid to supplement rather than supplant existing local, state and other funding. These libraries would be expected to serve, freely and equally, any and all persons. Nor is it pre-determined that the Intermediate Library would necessarily be a public library: the key consideration might well be the year-round availability of the facility. The Intermediate Library therefore, is designed to put a good, strong library within easy reach of everyone in the state.

HOURS OF OPENING OF LIBRARIES:

Perhaps I will be permitted a brief, but relevant digression. The

---

[1] Students of the Hacker and Geddes Reports will notice that I have taken the liberty of suggesting substantial changes in either the scope or the content of their recommendations. These are presumed to be reflective of changes in the library climate, but certainly reflect, as well, my own emphases and biases.

hours of opening of libraries seems critical in any discussion of access. New individual and social living patterns largely engendered by the phenomenon of the working wife have impelled many businesses and institutions to increase their hours of service dramatically. If libraries are to remain relevant, it would seem that they must do the same. The stream of public protests evoked by branch library cut-backs in hours of opening as well as the increasing use made by the public of Sunday openings are indicative of what is involved. I believe that even the smallest library should set for itself a goal of being open 5 days/25 hours per week, and that those times of opening, as much as possible, include weekends and evenings. It is suggested that consideration be given to changing Commissioner's Regulations (especially as Local Sponsor Incentive Aid is increased) so that a reasonable quid pro quo in the way of additional hours of opening be asked of libraries in exchange for additional state aid. A provisional suggestion for hours of opening, to be phased-in over the next few years, is:

Population	Minimum Weekly Standard Hours/Days
Below 2,500	25 hours/5 days
2,501-4,999	40 hours/6 days
5,000-9,999	48 hours/6 days
10,000-24,999	60 hours/7 days
25,000 and over	72 hours/7 days

Library Development should urge all libraries to avail themselves of competent Comprehensive Employment and Training Act personnel to help staff the library during extra hours. In addition, LSCA and Central Library aid should be augmented, and Systems urged to make incentive grants to member libraries to increase hours of opening.

SUPPLEMENTAL MEANS OF ACCESS AND THE IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY

Becker's[2] concept of "opportunity cost" enables us to understand why even a "free" service such as is offered by the library may not be used much. In a word, there is a cost in time to go to a library, no matter how near or convenient. The result is a need for supplemental means of access such as mobile service, storefront reading centers, work-place libraries, and mail-order service. The latter, especially, may lend itself to regional or state-level coordination or consolidation. Nor should such notions as drive-in service to libraries, based on calling ahead for materials, be ignored by planners or architects. In general, no device used by commerce to market its wares should be beyond consideration by libraries seeking to make themselves more accessible. The library "market" is so far from being saturated, that there is ample room for the peaceful co-existence of many means.

It is clear that none of the means so far mentioned reduce the "opportunity cost" of acquiring information from the library to anywhere near that of commercial radio or television, for example. Parity is probably not possible, necessary, or desirable. Still, the library has opportunities it is barely utilizing so far as cable television is concerned. In a similar vein, it is good that New York State will finally begin to reach the blind and print-handicapped through the use of dedicated FM sub-channels. A state programming capability to supplement local channels for the blind is recommended.

---

[2] G.S. Becker, "A Theory of the Allocation of Time," The Economic Journal, 75, 1965 pp. 493-517

The means used for the transmission of knowledge reflect the pace of knowledge accumulation, which is itself dependent on the rate of social and especially technological change. Oral communication, the "organic" mode of knowledge-transfer was adequate for traditional, primary, relatively static societies. A printed record became necessary for a society in which contract replaced status, and in which the mobility of labor and its increasing specialization combined to produce too much knowledge too quickly for memory to suffice (although organic knowledge-transfer was and is never replaced).

Especially since the second World War, the quantitative increase of information has "turned into a new quality;" the pace of change has so quickened, specialization so deepened , competition so intensified, that it is not too much to say that whatever is, is wrong or at least obsolete and that, paradoxically, the only reality is the future. In such a world, print and its various modalities are too slow to meet some of the informational needs of the time--although it, like its predecessor, will, in my opinion, always be necessary for certain kinds of information transmission. Thus, characteristic means of knowledge-transfer in our time involve the audio-visual, electronic computer and communications technologies which, at least theoretically, allow for virtually instantaneous and universally accessible communication. So far, these processes are not, by and large, inter-active or very diversified: Communication is usually one-way, the recipient passive, his choices narrow. When, if, and as all of these limiting factors--which are economic and social rather than technical--are overcome, the electronic information age will truly be upon us.

Enough of this technology is already in place for libraries to "tune in" where they have not already done so, or turn the volume up, where they have...especially in New York State which already enjoys, in uneven measure, the benefits of such systems as: 3R's, NYSILL, Public Library Systems, the SUNY System, the beginnings of school library systems, BRS, New York Times, OCLC, FAUL, SUNY Tape Analysis, Gaylord, Bowker, BATAB, facsimile transmission und zo weiter.

A NEW YORK STATE INFORMATION POLICY

It may be time for either the Commissioner of Education or the Governor to convene a blue-ribbon Commission on New York State Information Policy comparable to and articulating with the Committee that produced the National Information Policy (NIP). The aim would be the development of a coordinated State Information Policy. Again, following NIP, the Commission might deal with questions of whether a new Information Agency is needed or if one or several existing governmental entities might be expanded or refocussed to accomplish the goal. The Commission would have to be inter-agency in character, cross types of libraries, and be representative of the private sector, local government and academic and professional disciplines concerned with information policy issues. It might well have representatives of information users as well as of the general public. The state information network to be designed should be, as noted, compatible with the national network and would build on existing library and other resources.

In the interim, it would be desirable for every library, of every type, to be eligible to become part of the statewide network, able to borrow every kind of material. The aim would be to ensure total access to all library resources and programs in New York State for all library users and potential

users through local access to some type of library. Such institutional access into the statewide network should continue to be by means of coordinated referral patterns established by the State Education Department. The concomitant responsibility of each participating institution would be to make a reasonable effort to meet its own library needs. Again: there should be no discrimination against any type of library, any type of request, any user. There should continue to be free dissemination throughout the state of bibliographies of holdings of major libraries, and the training of staff in their use and in referring requests. There should be reference service of last resort provided either by Regional 3R's or by the New York State Library. An 800 number "library line" should be established for this purpose, as in Connecticut. Finally, the project for the promotion of computerized literature searches should be continued indefinitely and both the number of allowable requests and the number of databases accessed should be increased.

DIRECT ACCESS: THE GEDDES REPORT:

The major question dealt with by the Geddes Report[3] was the unwillingness or inability of some communities to tax themselves to support adequate libraries. When users from such communities borrow hugely from well-supported libraries, the latter may protest at being forced to serve too many

---

[3] In this context, a few definitions may be in order:
Access: The use of all member libraries in a public library system by all the residents of the area legally served by the System.
Direct Access: Means that the use shall be in person rather than through interlibrary loan.
Free Direct Access (FDA): Means that there shall be no charge to the user, either for the individual transaction or in the form of an annual or other non-resident fee, although the library used may be reimbursed in some way from System funds or other sources. In the strictest sense, FDA covers all the types of in-person library use, including reference and other use which may not result in the borrowing of materials for use outside the library.

from outside their chartered-to-serve area. Since Free Direct Access (FDA) to all of the libraries within a system is a state requirement, the result has been that a few libraries have either withdrawn or considered withdrawal from Systems rather than comply. Regulations were in fact modified in 1968 to provide that it would no longer be necessary to extend FDA to jurisdictions exceeding 10,000 population which could establish local libraries but had not done so.

There does not seem to be any problem with the on-site use of libraries, but there have been difficulties for some larger, better-supported, libraries in unreimbursed FDA, where "excessive" borrowing of materials by non-residents is involved. The situation becomes acute if there is a feeling in the larger library that nearby communities are not making an adequate effort to support local library service. There tend to be few or no problems with unreimbursed FDA in (1) consolidated systems supported by Counties, (2) in areas where major city libraries are wholly or largely supported by Counties, (3) in rural areas where libraries are under-used, (4) in Cooperative systems where substantial state and County monies are funnelled to member libraries and (5) in places where there has been a shift from village to town support of libraries.

Where there is a problem, the direct way to deal with the matter is for the System to use state and/or County monies to reimburse member libraries for "over-use," however defined, by non-residents. Otherwise an unfair burden may be placed on local tax-payers. The "direct way" has been tried in some systems, solving the problem or shifting it to the question of fair level of compensation. There may be an ebb and flow to the difficulty: better funding for libraries from any source eases the pain; increased Local Sponsor Incentive Act money, which after all does not go to unserved areas, may have a similar effect; increased hours of opening for all

libraries, increased access to many types of libraries, the possible creation of Intermediate Libraries may also be helpful. Contracts, which include reimbursal, between strong libraries and unserved or poorly served jurisdictions are another possible answer. In the absence of complete state support of libraries or the transformation of all systems into County systems there will probably always be justifiable and unjustifiable imbalances in the support given libraries by different communities.

A "simple solution" discussed by Geddes was the earmarking of state aid for FDA reimbursal: "While the Committee on Direct Access believes that intrasystem FDA among member public libraries is so much an integral and inseparable feature of the public library system concept in New York State that separate supplemental state support could not logically be sought for that specific purpose, the Committee nevertheless is convinced that the cause of improved library service could be no better served than by new state funds granted for the specific purpose of extending FDA to encompass all types of libraries." It may be time to dust this interesting speculation off and look at it again. Perhaps an intratype and intertype state reimbursal factor should be investigated. If not, and the problem begins to boil and there seems no way to meet it at the local level (a perhaps unusual concatenation of events) I would suggest that, "logical" or not, earmarked state reimbursal monies be sought and administered for "plus use" among public libraries (perhaps as is currently being done in the State of Connecticut).

STATEWIDE LIBRARY CARD

Parenthetically, the movement toward a statewide library card continues and the concept of a statewide library card good in all types of libraries refuses to die. Sometimes in history one can skip a stage

of development: perhaps it is time to look seriously at the latter notion. Credit-card technology makes it conceivable. If the idea of one card good at all types of libraries in the entire state takes one's breath away, the state might fund a pilot project in one region and, incidentally, test FDA reimbursal for plus use across types of libraries. It should be noted that SUNY campuses honor each other's library cards and that community colleges are freely available to the general public as are some school libraries (an undetermined number of which are also open some weekday evenings). These are all promising harbingers of facilitated access.

FEES FOR SERVICE

So long as the spectre of reimbursement is already stalking these pages, it may not be amiss for the author to indicate his negative opinion of that school of thought which would charge individual patrons directly for special services, whether these be of the data bank variety or whatever. The very strong tradition of no charge for public library service should be as sacred as that of free public education. Both the public library and the public school were conceived of as social equalizers, not because of some "goody-good" theories but because it was felt that society would benefit from the fruits of individual energy and enterprise and thus that individuals should be given a free public education (and free public libraries) in order to enable them to become more productive. If we introduce charges for some services, that means that some (the information-poor) are far less likely to use them, reducing the potential gain in individual and social productivity. In any event, there is likely to be a bigger social pay-off from providing for the needs of the information-poor than the information rich, simply because following marginal utility theory,

the latter have access to so much information already that they gain comparatively little from any increment.

To the rejoinder that libraries will not be able to afford new services unless they charge for them, I would respond that that view is entirely too pessimistic. The idea is to build a constituency for the new services. If they prove to be useful, people will ultimately help libraries get the support for them that is needed. Access ought to include the newest informational tools.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: PARTICULAR AND GENERAL

Ready access to current information is, today, as important as access to formal education was (and is). Not only is current information absolutely vital to individual survival because of the accelerated rate of social and technical change, but lack of it inhibits economic, social and political development; inhibits, that is, social progress. The concept is relatively new because the Information Age is relatively young. The Founding Fathers understood that representative government was dependent on access to information, hence the First Amendment. But that the functioning of the economy depends on quick and full access to information is a new concept which waited on a significant change in the nature of the national economy--a change from the production of goods to the production of services and information.

Thus the point of view of the ordinary library user who resents all barriers to access needs to be respected. He may be a lot smarter than the library and other bureaucrats who try to rationalize lack of access. The "ordinary user" may think somewhat as follows: "I want to be able to use any library supported by public funds since as a taxpayer I paid for them. And I want to be able to read or view anything; the First

Amendment says I can and anyway as a taxpayer, I have already paid a good part of the cost of whatever is written--authors having been educated at public schools I paid for, and most recent research having been paid for by tax dollars. Moreover, almost no libraries or schools are any longer supported by private gifts alone. and even private gifts, in the form of the deduction are publicly subsidized. Anyway, if people speak of 'equal access' they ought to mean it."

For this reason, any and all constraints on the free flow of information need to be carefully considered and narrowly construed. Such constraints might well be considered guilty until proven innocent.

The late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, in interpreting the limited monopoly granted by law known as copyright wrote: "The sole interest of the United States and the primary object in conferring the monopoly lie in the general benefit derived by the public from the labors of authors." The new copyright law is the consequence of the new technology which makes the duplication and communication of material easy and instantaneous at a time when the demand for information has grown exponentially. Whether and to what extent it will act as a brake on the diffusion of knowledge or an accelerator of the production of knowledge remains to be seen. The outcome largely depends on the application of the Fair Use Doctrine by librarians and other disseminators of information and the reaction to that application by publishers and authors.

Fair Use is the legal right to copy without permission or payment a limited amount of copyrighted material where the use is reasonable and not unduly harmful to the copyright owner.

In the matter of restricting the rights of the young to read what they wish to read and lodging that right in parents instead, Broderick's strong statement should at least be carefully considered:

"...children must grow up in a world broader than that of their parents...(and) there is a concept...that there are issues which transcend an individual's rites and on which the general welfare... takes precedence. When education became compulsory, it removed from parents the rite to have their children grow up ignorant...and when compulsory vaccination was introduced, it removed the rite of parents to determine whether their children would or would not be vaccinated. In our present era, we see these events as representing nothing more than common sense, forgetting the struggle it took to achieve them."

"The problem is that we want to keep the young from making the mistakes of our generation without recognizing that our environment no longer exists...Thus, none of our experiences are particularly helpful to...the young in dealing with today's world..."

"Do we understand that, when a school system sets up a sex education course and says that only those students whose parents give approval may take it...all of us will eventually be forced to pay for the ignorance imposed on those young people?"

Finally, when one thinks of access one tends to focus on the bibliographic control and document delivery aspects. The ability to use the mechanisms of bibliographic control become increasingly important, however. Arranging for the successful marriage of patron and material becomes an ever more specialized skill requiring a marriage broker in the form of a librarian or information specialist. Once again, it is the proliferation and fractionation of knowledge which is responsible. In this context, the librarian functions as teacher of information acquisition skills as well as provider of information. All the more pathetic the plight of school librarians and school libraries in this state and the various freezes on and terminations of public, college and university librarians. There can be little doubt that a less-trained labor force and a less knowledge-based commerce and government will be the result.

The interest in access by libraries, the library profession, and the friends of libraries is an old and honorable one. New impulses toward freer access to information have arisen amoung the general public as a reaction to a generation of cold war over-concern with security and secrecy

capped by Watergate. This movement, codified in the Freedom of Information Act and various sunshine laws has induced optimism that we may be seeing the dawn of a newer, more open age. But optimism must be tempered (in the sense of toughened) by that sound dose of scepticism that will keep us vigilant. The uncertain effects of the new copyright law, the seemingly irreversible contraction in the number of daily newspapers in the United States, the near control of the electronic media by a handful of national networks that compete less by offering a diversity of content than of packaging, the rising cost of all kinds of information and many other phenomena testify to the existence of a countervailing tendency. While there is undoubtedly more information than ever being produced, there may not be more high-quality, useful knowledge available to the great majority.

The extraordinary production of information and the equally extraordinary capacity of the new technology to disseminate it also tends to make us optimistic about the possibilities for new and improved access. But we need to remember that the copying technology that made it impossible to keep the Pentagon papers a secret, also led to a copyright law intended to be more restrictive; and we should know that the Freedom of Information Act has perhaps been used most by companies trying to find out each others trade secrets. Thus, there is a Janus-like character to all the new developments in access. In the final analysis, information is property, withal a very unique kind of property, and thus access is limited by institutional and individual ability to pay. Information is also power; hence its diffusion may be resisted.

The removal of limits to access is not just a matter for the "state" or some other "higher level." Limitations may be covertly or overtly, consciously or unconsciously practiced by any library insofar as it restricts the use of its materials and services by any of its patrons for

whatever reason; insofar as it avoids censorship problems by avoiding the acquisition of materials in "problem areas" and insofar as it does not continually make the widest possible public aware of its resources.

What all of this means is that libraries, librarians, and friends of libraries need to remain assiduous in their continuing and probably unending effort to widen and deepen access to information by all.

Notes on Author

Murray L. Bob is the Director of the Chautauqua-Cattaraugus Library System and the Director of the James Prendergast Free Library. Over the years, Mr. Bob has had a keen interest in the subject of access and has published articles on access and intellectual freedom. He is a member of the New York State Governor's Commission on Libraries, past president of the New York Library Association, and past chairman, Public Library Systems Directors Organization. He is also a former member of the Regents Advisory Council on Libraries.